



## Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird without Wings?

Dahl, Hanne Marlene

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):  
[10.5278/freia.14136645](https://doi.org/10.5278/freia.14136645)

Publication date:  
1995

Document Version  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):  
Dahl, H. M. (1995). *Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird without Wings?* Department of History, International and Social Studies, Aalborg University. FREIA's tekstserie No. 22  
<https://doi.org/10.5278/freia.14136645>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Hanne Marlene Dahl**

## **Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird without Wings?**

**FREIA**

*Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg  
Department of Development and Planning  
Aalborg University  
Fibigerstraede 2  
DK-9220 Aalborg Ö.  
Phone: +45 98-158522 Fax: +45 98-153298*

Paper  
February 1995

**22**

Hanne Marlene Dahl:

**Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird without Wings?  
Power, Signification and Gender in the Reproduction of Patriarchy**

Paper from

FREIA - Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg

Department of Development and Planning

Aalborg University

Fibigerstraede 2

DK-9220 Aalborg Ö

Phone: +45 98 158522

Print: Kopicentralen, Aalborg University, 1995

Layout: Inger Jensen and Ellen Nyrup Pedersen

ISSN: 0907-2179

FREIA's paper series contains working papers, papers for conferences and seminars, project descriptions, lecture manuscripts, chapters from books etc. The papers are made by researchers affiliated to FREIA or by researchers who have visited the centre. The paper series aims at spreading the knowledge of FREIA's activities, internally as well as externally. Editors of the series are Ann-Dorte Christensen and Ruth Emerek. The papers can be ordered at Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning, phone: +45 98 158522, ext. 2452.

**Hanne Marlene Dahl**

**Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy  
- Like a Bird without Wings?**

**Power, Signification and Gender in the Reproduction of Patriarchy**



## Preface

The papers published in FREIA's paper series nos. 17 - 25 were all presented at the conference on **Gender Relations - State, Market, and Civil Society: The Nordic Experiences in a European Perspective**, arranged by FREIA - Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg, Aalborg University, August 14 - 18, 1993.

The idea of the conference was to examine the development of gender relations in Denmark/the Nordic countries in a comparative European perspective. In focus was the relationship between state, market and civil society/the family in the Nordic countries: the significance of this relationship to the development of gender relations - and in reverse, the influence of gender relations on the development of the Nordic welfare states. A comparative European approach was chosen for its usefulness in highlighting the specificities of the "Nordic model" regarding gender relations.

A primary purpose was to strengthen national and international cooperation on Ph.D. programmes in Social Science Gender Studies. The conference addressed Danish senior researchers within the Social Sciences. A few Ph.D.-students were invited as well as experts from other Nordic countries and international capacities within the field. The number of participants was 25. The conference was financed by the Danish Social Science Research Council.

The programme of the conference included four sessions:

- I. Gender and the Labour Market
- II. Gender, Welfare, and the Family
- III. Gender, Power, and Democratic Citizenship
- IV. Gender Theory and Feminist Research.

The full programme of the conference will be found at the end of this publication together with a list of the conference papers published elsewhere.

Ruth Emerek & Anna-Birte Ravn

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Inequalities between women and men have been theorised in various ways. Two theorists, the English sociologist Sylvia Walby (1986) (1990) and the Swedish-Icelandic political theorist Anna G. Jónasdóttir (1991), have each developed a theory of the contemporary, Western form of patriarchy stressing the importance of work and love, respectively. Both Walby and Jónasdóttir define patriarchy as a system of exploitation *and* suppression. However, they assign analytical priority to the exploitation of women, whereby dominance and power are insufficiently theorised.<sup>2</sup> They disregard the *dynamical* aspect of the gender system: the 'how' of power. They neglect women's own motivations for consent, perception of own resources as well as potential points of resistance.

This article concerns the perception of power in these two theories of patriarchy. Walby's and Jónasdóttir's theories are chosen, since they are at present the most important contributors to this area of theory and representative in respect to some of the theoretical shortcomings in this group of theories in general. It is my thesis that both theories are inadequate in their theorisation of how the contemporary patriarchy/gender system is reproduced and transformed through time. Reproduction can be understood as defined the English sociologist Anthony Giddens in his theory of structuration as:

'...the knowledgeable application and reapplication of the rules and resources by actors in situated social contexts: all interaction thus has, in every circumstance, to be contingently "brought of" by those who are party to it' (Giddens, 1979, p. 114).

My polemical title's bird without wings symbolises the not fully fledged theories. That Walby and Jónasdóttir mainly conceptualise power as power-over, whereas the second face of power: power-to, is neglected.<sup>3</sup>

**Three approaches** to power can remedy this insufficiency: power understood as relational capacities (a realist view), power as implicated in structures of signification and as constructive (post-structuralism) and power as 'empowerment' (some female theorists). In my view, these three approaches are not mutually exclusive. Therefore I have chosen a selective and somewhat eclectic approach mainly inspired by the American political theorist Jeffrey C. Isaac (Isaac, 1987). His realist position, however, can be improved by the integration of a post-modern feminism and an integration of the concept 'empowerment'. These approaches contribute to an understanding of how power is reproduced and transformed in a gender system<sup>4</sup>, since each develops elements of power-to.

I will now briefly explain these approaches to power. Then I will discuss Walby and Jónasdóttir's theories separately in relation to reproduction and power. I discuss their perception of power from the perspective of power-to. Finally, I will return to the three approaches and elaborate the ways in which they point towards an improved theorisation of power.

According to Isaac power is relationally constituted capacities, which are permanently open to negotiation (Isaac, 1987, pp. 79-95). Relations of power contain both elements of inequality and reciprocity. This implies that the reproduction of patriarchal relations cannot be simplified to men's individual or collective restraints upon women's actions, but must be seen as a result of conflict, negotiation and consensus between men and women.

The French historian Michel Foucault has theorised the ambiguous character of power by emphasizing its productive aspects: the creation of contexts of meaning and subjects (Foucault, 1978; 1980; 1982). Inspired by Foucault, the English literary Chris Weedon and the likewise English psychologist Wendy Hollway have perceived gender relations

as power relations, where gendered subjectivities provide certain ways of being, ways of interpreting our experiences, and certain divisions of responsibilities. Gendered subjectivities are not created once and for all. Instead they are produced in a relational process where gender is implicated in a struggle about the content of masculinity and femininity (Weedon, 1987, pp. 97-101) (Hollway, 1984, pp. 228-230; Hollway, 1989, pp. 66-86)<sup>5</sup>.

Several female theorists, such as the German-American philosopher Hannah Arendt and the American political theorist Kathy Ferguson, have in various ways articulated a view of power as 'empowerment'<sup>6</sup>. They perceive power as a collective capacity either as action in concert or co-operation, which create new options (Arendt 1958, pp. 199-203) (Ferguson, 1987, p. 221).

These three approaches to power can improve the theoretical and empirical insufficiencies in Walby and Jónasdóttir's theories. Theoretically the exploitation of women's work or love is conditioned upon an underlying relation of dominance and power. Exploitation cannot solely be explained by coercion or physical force, but implies an element of co-operation, however unwillingly or involuntarily, on part of the exploited (Dahl, 1993, pp. 111-113)<sup>7</sup>. Empirically inequalities between men and women persist in Scandinavia, despite an institutionalised equal opportunity policy and a norm of equality in the discursive consciousness of most men and women, wherefore it is necessary to theorise the mechanisms, which maintain present gender relations (Hernes, 1987) (Haavind, 1985, pp. 18-22) (Kvinnor och män i Norden, 1988).

The theorisation of women's participation in the reproduction of existing gender relations must acknowledge the complexity of dominance, i.e. that there exist barriers and possibilities for women, coercion and voluntariness (Siim, 1992, pp. 11-12) (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 205, p. 195

& p. 225). This, however, does neither imply that suppression and exploitation are self-inflicted nor a result of masochism, but that structural coercion cannot in itself explain the reproduction of gender inequalities.

## **Reproduction and Power in Walby's and Jónasdóttir's Theories**

Although Walby and Jónasdóttir both define the present gender system as relations of exploitation and suppression, they neglect its dynamical aspects: the reproduction and transformation of power relations. Both analytically focus upon the exploitation of women despite their different understandings of the character of exploitation. In Walby's view, the exploitation of women's labour is of primary importance, e.i. men's appropriation of women's socio-material resources, whereas Jónasdóttir emphasises men's exploitation of women's love, i.e. of their socio-existential resources.

**Walby** defines patriarchy as a system of social structures and practices, where men dominate, oppress and exploit women, and which is analytically independent of system of capitalism (Walby, 1986, pp. 51-52; Walby, 1990, p. 20). In her view, the present gender system consists of six, relatively autonomous structures, which have a reciprocal impact on each other. These structures are: *the patriarchal mode of production, patriarchal relations in paid work, patriarchal culture, patriarchal sexuality, male violence and patriarchal relations in the state*. In her specific thesis of the change of patriarchy from a private form to a more public, Walby emphasises paid work and the state as particularly important structures (Walby, 1990, pp. 23-24 & p. 178).

Methodologically Walby is a structuralist despite her agreement with Giddens at the theoretical level (Walby, 1989, pp. 220-221; Walby, 1990, p. 19). Her structuralism implies that she cannot capture how change and reproduction in the gender system occur more concretely. When Walby applies her framework upon empirical material, she largely neglects agency and the duality of structure<sup>8</sup> (Dahl, 1989, pp. 8-15; Dahl, 1993, pp. 67-68). In Walby's view, the central mechanism reproducing exploitation and suppression is structural, material coercion. According to Walby, women consent to the continued exploitation, since they are financially dependant upon men due to the gender segregated labour market (Walby, 1990, pp. 87-88).

Nonetheless, Walby's work contains elements of power-to. In her first book: 'Patriarchy at Work' (1986), Walby applies a relational approach to power in an empirical section on the political struggles about the protective legislation in Great Britain<sup>9</sup> (Walby, 1986, pp. 90-155). In this section, Walby perceives the resources of agents as relationally constituted at various levels and as negotiable. On the other hand, Walby indirectly rejects a relational approach to power in her analysis of the mechanisms, which maintain the low participation rates of women and their position within the English labour market. This can be seen from the importance Walby assigns to the gender segregated labour market compared to the relatively small importance she assigns to the negotiations taking place between men and women in the household (Walby, 1990, pp. 56-57). Structures become external to the actions of agents, since they are reified. Consequently, Walby cannot capture the transformations of structures caused by the continuous negotiation of gender, rights and obligations.

In her latest book: 'Theorizing Patriarchy' (Walby, 1990), Walby partly applies a Foucault-inspired discourse theory. Thereby she integrates aspects of a post-modern perception of power, where power is implied

in contexts of meaning and constitutes the subject itself. Walby perceives of gender as produced in discourses, but the understanding of gendered subjectivity, of various forms of masculinities and femininities, is only integrated into her chapters on the two structures: patriarchal culture and sexuality (Walby, 1990, p. 94 & p. 122). By this understanding of the subject, Walby captures one of the mechanisms which reproduce unequal gender relations, since gendered subjectivities form our ways of experiencing and interpreting our experiences. The subject is understood as a process rather than a given thing, since it is perceived as relationally constituted. However, this understanding of the gendered subject is only unsystematically integrated into her theory of patriarchy for which reason Walby can neither perceive the gender system as reproduced relationally in all spheres through a confirmation of men and women's gendered subjectivities nor the permanent possibility of resistance and change. Cultural factors, such as discursively constructed femininities and masculinities, are not assigned any special importance in Walby's theory. This can be seen from her causal argument about the present form of patriarchal culture. She argues that a general change in femininity from private domesticity to sexual attractiveness to men have *followed* the material changes in gender relations, i.e. women's access to paid work (Walby, 1990, p. 67, p. 108).

Concerning 'empowerment', there are a few examples of women's common actions, cooperation or resistance in Walby's books. In her first book, Walby calls attention to the groups of women, who protested against the protective legislation (Walby, 1986, pp. 119-122). In her second book, Walby mentions women's individual and collective resistances in her analysis of male violence against women (Walby, 1990, pp. 146-148).

Concluding, Walby generally considers the reproduction of the gender system as a result of material, structural coercion. In my interpretation



of Walby, women have no other alternatives than to consent to a subordinate position, where their work is exploited. As a result, Walby largely reduces power to power-over, whereby she neglects the dynamics of interaction and the micro-cosmos of power. Only unsystematically does Walby include power as negotiated relations, as present in our gendered subjectivities and as new options, which arise by women's common actions.

**Jónasdóttir** defines patriarchy as a political, sexual power structure. With this definition Jónasdóttir attempts to capture the comprehensiveness of male dominance (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 182). However, in her view exploitation is the main concept, since it is most expedient in relation to the explanatory aim of her theorizing (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 93). In contrast to Walby, Jónasdóttir perceives patriarchy as a system with only *one* basic structure of exploitation, where men exploit *women's love* understood as care and sexuality (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 50). Exploitation mainly takes place in heterosexual relationship, but has indirect and derivatory consequences for women in the public sphere including the labour market<sup>10</sup> (Jónasdóttir, 1991, pp. 112-114).

Women transfer love power, which is a kind of socio-existential power to men. Love power consists of the capacities and energies, which are vital to how we perform our social existence, i.e. our autonomy. This unequal exchange concerns the gendered rights to each others' bodies and minds. In the exchange men's self-esteem is augmented and they become personal authorities. It is not love *per se*, which causes the exploitation of women, but rather a particular, alienated practice of love (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 220)<sup>11</sup>.

In Jónasdóttir's view inequalities between men and women are reproduced in a form of dominance, which combines freedom and structural coercion (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 105, p. 225). Women consent



to exploitation, to perform loving care without reciprocity, because of internalised complementary gender roles and women's lack of alternatives. Jónasdóttir argues that the reproduction of gender inequalities is based upon cultural factors: the socialisation of girls and boys. According to Jónasdóttir, girls and boys in early childhood internalise gender-specific roles, norms and values, which, among others, include informal norms for what men legitimately can claim from women (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 36). Simultaneously Jónasdóttir stresses the importance of a confirmation of one's gender identity, when conforming to the dominant gender roles (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 195). I believe that Jónasdóttir points to an important mechanism in the reproduction of exploitative practices, when she directs attention to the confirmation of ourselves as women in the love process.

Jónasdóttir's main contribution to an understanding of the reproduction of gender inequalities in Scandinavia, is her thesis of a new kind of male authority, which masks itself as generally human and substantially can be described as an alienation of love<sup>12</sup> (Jónasdóttir, 1991, pp. 222-224). Authority is legitimate power, which is not in need of justification (Connolly, 1974, pp. 97-112). This form of authority, which especially men possess, can explain why women comply to an unequal exchange, since authority can be interpreted as a form of power, which masks itself. However, this form of authority cannot empirically describe the kind of gender relations, which are better characterised as negotiated, contractual relations<sup>13</sup>. We need to consider negotiation and male authority as two complementary mechanisms in the reproduction of patriarchy.

Since Jónasdóttir does not apply her theoretical framework to empirical material like Walby, I can only analyse her conceptualisation of power at a general, abstract level. Basically Jónasdóttir advocates a realist

approach to power inspired by Isaac, among others (Jónasdóttir, 1991, p. 238, footnote 17) She understands gender relations as an arena of power, where the struggle concerns the rights and obligations implied in gender roles. Jónasdóttir perceives of women as participants in the reproduction of gender inequalities, but she does not specify the implications of this view (Jónasdóttir, 1984, p. 127).

Compared to the postmodern feminists' understanding of power, signification and subjectivity, Jónasdóttir overestimates the unity of the subject and the existence of a common womanhood in her perception of gender roles. Although Jónasdóttir perceives gender roles as continuously negotiated, she does not 'see' that the subject is constituted in various discourses and that there exist different, competing discourses on femininity and masculinity. Consequently, she undervalues the changes, which continuously occur in the micro-cosmos of power. The micro-cosmos of power is a Foucauldian term, which refers to the sites of power not usually perceived of such as the politics of everyday life and the constitution of subjectivity.

Even though Jónasdóttir considers women as participants in the gender system, she does not theoretically include 'empowerment' as an aspect of power-to: the new options created by women through collective action and co-operation. In an earlier article on power, Jónasdóttir acknowledges that power-to as a collective capacity needs to be integrated into the concept of power. This recognition is, however, not integrated into her theory of patriarchy (Jónasdóttir, 1986, p. 145).

In her theorizing on this particular practice of love, Jónasdóttir names an intuitively known phenomena: *that love in a way removes power from women*. Simultaneously, she describes a particular form of male authority, which legitimises men's power over women. Thereby Jónasdóttir contributes to an improved understanding of the reproduction of gender

inequalities. This presumed form of authority is not investigated empirically. Neither is Jónasdóttir's conceptualisation of power adequate, since it neither integrates a view of power as traversing subjectivity and as present in several, competing discourses of femininity, nor integrates 'empowerment' into her view. The motivation of women and their perception of available resources, individually or collectively, are largely neglected, which implies that the dynamics of patriarchy cannot be captured.

Walby and Jónasdóttir insufficiently theorise dominance and power, since the reproduction of patriarchy is either explained by *structural, material coercion* or by *structural, cultural coercion*. Whereas Walby focuses upon women's material dependence of men, Jónasdóttir emphasizes women's need for a confirmation of their gender identity in a practice of love, which exploits women. Their different social, economic and political realities might explain their emphasis upon different aspects: work and financial dependencies, love and cultural as well as emotional factors<sup>14</sup>. Irregardless of these differences, their theories cannot capture the dynamics of gender relations, since they do not systematically integrate agents' perceptions of alternatives and possible resistances, e.g. in the creation of new forms of femininities and common actions with other women. Nonetheless, they each contribute with new recognitions, since they each articulate elements of power-to in a preliminary form. Walby partly perceives of gender as relationally and processually constituted, and Jónasdóttir conceptualises dominance as characterised by coercion and voluntariness and as reproduced by a particular, male form of authority: a kind of personal authority.

## **Towards an improved Theorisation of Dominance and Power**

I will now explicate the three aspects of power-to, which I have applied in my criticism of Walby's and Jónasdóttir's conceptualisations of power.

Isaac defines power as relationally constituted capacities in enduring relations, e.g. relationships, the workplace or in teaching situations between students and lecturer (Isaac, 1987, p. 80). Power is immanent in enduring relations, where social identities such as husband and wife, chief and secretary, teacher and pupil distribute rights and obligations understood in a broad normative sense. In such social practices there is both asymmetry and reciprocity, since social identities distribute capacities asymmetrically and where the exercise of power is conditioned upon the consent of the other<sup>15</sup> (Isaac, 1987, p. 76, pp. 87-93). Consequently, power in normatively constituted practices is contingent. Thereby Isaac integrates a dynamical perspective into his concept of power:

'To emphasize that power relations always involve some element of reciprocity is not to deny the salience of domination. It is to recognize that dominance...involves the mutual performance of activities. This recognition also enables us to incorporate directly into the conceptualization of power the chronic negotiation attending its exercise' (Isaac, 1987, p. 89).

There are, however, two problems in Isaac's theory: it cannot capture the more marginal forms of power<sup>16</sup>, and it is not expedient in a situation where there exist several, competing discourses on a given social identity, as for example gender. These aspects of power are theorised by the post-modern feminists.

Post-modern feminists, such as Weedon and Hollway, are inspired by Foucault in their perception of power and the subject. Foucault criticises the traditional concept of power as exclusively focusing upon its restraining properties. In his opinion, the traditional view of power conceals certain forms of power and their mechanisms. Instead, Foucault argues that power is ambiguous, since power also is productive:

'...what makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh upon us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse' (Foucault, 1980, p. 119).

According to Foucault, power is not outside the subject, but produces and traverses it (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). In Weedon's and Hollway's view this means that the subject adopts a subject position, which is defined in relation to the opposing gender subjectivity and which can best be conceptualised as an ongoing process. Gender subjectivity assigns to us a way of understanding our consciousness, body and emotions including a selective perception (Weedon, 1987, p. 112) (Hollway, 1984, p. 228). It crucially conditions our self-perception and the opportunities for self-realization. Gender subjectivity is not a stable, homogenous entity, since it is reproduced and changed in interaction. However, not all possible subjectivities are open to us, since the discursive positions available depend upon the concrete, historical context (Weedon, 1987, p. 123). Generally, there exist two discourses, which relationally constitute each other in a continuous struggle: a discourse on femininity and a discourse on masculinity. It is actually a disingenuity to speak of a discourse on femininity and a discourse on masculinity. Within these two discourses, there exist various forms of femininity and masculinity, such as argued by the Australian sociologist Bob Connell and the Danish

literary Marianne Kruckow (Connell, 1987, p. 183) (Kruckow, 1992, pp. 68-69).

The third aspect of power-to, which it is necessary to integrate into existing theories of patriarchy, is 'empowerment'. Both Arendt and Ferguson have theorised power as positive and collective<sup>17</sup>:

'Power corresponds to the human ability not just to act, but to *act in concert*' (Arendt, 1986, p. 64, my emphasis)

'Power could be translated into empowerment, the *ability to act with others to do together what one could not have done alone*' (Ferguson, 1987, p. 221, my emphasis)

In their view, power cannot be reduced to power-over, i.e as a change in the preferences of a person or as restraints upon its possibilities of actions. Instead power is creative, since it can be a common act or co-operation releasing new and hitherto unknown resources (Arendt, 1958, pp. 199-203). Examples of such common actions are co-operation between women on various levels, e.g. in parliaments, organisations and in neighbourhoods.

Common to all three aspects of power-to is a conceptualisation of power as contingent, relational and constructive. Aspects which are necessary to integrate into theories of patriarchy if we aspire towards more dynamic theories.

## **Conclusion**

I have argued, that two contemporary theories of patriarchy largely focus upon exploitation and structural coercion. Thereby they neglect the dynamics of gender relations, which is due to their insufficient integration of three aspects of power-to: power as negotiated rights and obligations, power as implicated in gender, and power as common action and co-operation. However, both theorists articulate elements of power-to. Whereas Walby partly advocates a postmodern perception of gender, Jónasdóttir perceives power as relationally constituted rights and obligations in the practice of love. Additionally, Jónasdóttir contributes to an improved understanding of the reproduction of patriarchy through the theorisation of a particular, male authority. If, however, the three mentioned aspects of power are integrated into Walby's and Jónasdóttir's theories, they will become more adequate theoretically and empirically. This demands more contextual theory which elaborates upon how women consent to suppressive relations, or how they alternatively resist these.

## Notes:

1. This article has previously been published in a Danish Version: 'Nyere patriarkatsteori - som en fugl uden vinger? Magt, mening og køn i reproduktion af patriarkatet', pp. 123-144 in the anthology: **Teorier om patriarkatet - Betydelser, begrænsninger og udviklingslinier** by Anna G. Jónasdóttir and Gunnela Björk (eds.), Högskolan i Örebro, 1994. I thank the editors for their kind permission to publish it in English.
2. In my view, exploitation is a normative concept, which covers situations, where some agents (men) take unfair advantage of other agents (women) - there is a certain lack of reciprocity (Cohen, 1979, p.343). By dominance, I understand a system of asymmetrically distributed resources, which is relatively persistent and where women's choices are different and harder compared to men's (Hernes, 1987, p. 15). A system which limits women's possibilities for self-realization.
3. By power-over, I understand the traditional view of power as advocated by Max Weber and Robert Dahl. Within this tradition, power is perceived of as an intention, which limits the possibilities of action, and it is a view stressing conflict or the potential use of physical force (Weber, 1984, p.89) (Dahl, 1957).
4. For an elaboration, please consult my thesis: Hanne Marlene Dahl, **Two Faces of Patriarchy: Love and Work - and their Inadequacies**, Institute of Political Science, Aarhus University, 1993, unpublished.
5. In my view, gendered subjectivity is a process, where the subject is neither unitary nor determined in any essentialist way, but has a *core self* such as argued by the post-modern psychologist Jane Flax. In her view, a plural and dynamically perceived subject can simultaneously be decentered and contain a minimal form of self, or in other words have an experience of individuality and self-awareness (Flax, 1990, p. 220) (Hollway, 1989, p. 25).
6. I apply the concept 'empowerment' exclusively as a theoretical concept, i.e. as an aspect of power-to and not as a historical, descriptive term.
7. Even though I believe that exploitation and dominance are dependent and interrelated, they are analytically distinct phenomena. Whereas exploitation concerns a transfer of resources, dominance concerns consent, the legitimacy



of social relations, and directs our attention to agents' perception of situations and possible alternatives. By consent, I understand explicit and tacit consent, whereby I am in agreement with Giddens, who argues that consent is a broad category and of a rather diffuse character.

8. The concept the 'duality of structure' is intended to illustrate the mutual dependence between the concepts 'structure' and 'agency', i.e. that the choice between structuralism and methodological individualism is a false one (Giddens, 1979, p. 53; Giddens, 1984, p. 25). In his view, structures do not exist independently of action and action presumes the existence of structures: '...all structural properties of the social system are the medium and outcome of contingently accomplished activities of situated actors' (Giddens, 1984, p. 191).
9. The English protective legislation was implemented between 1844 and 1901. Whereas Marxist inspired theorists have interpreted the legislation as a victory for the working class, feminists like Walby have claimed that the legislation was patriarchal in its intentions and consequences (Walby, 1986). For a critical assessment of Walby's claim about a patriarchal intention, please see Dahl, 1989, pp. 47-57.
10. One of the least developed aspects of Jónasdóttir's theory are gender relations in the state and in the labour market. This means that it is analytically difficult to differentiate between the sexual and the economic exploitation of women, e.g. when women's socio-existential resources are appropriated in the service sector or in care work (Dahl, 1993, pp. 91-94).
11. Jónasdóttir's theory contains some general presumptions on love as an existential activity on a par with work and a more specific theory on the importance of a contemporary practice of freely given love for the reproduction of gender inequalities in Scandinavia today. For an elaboration of the concept of 'love power' and some of its merits and problems, please consult my thesis pp. 84-88 and pp. 89-94 (Dahl, 1993).
12. This new, male form of authority is a kind of personal authority which is both similar to and different from traditional authority such as described by Weber (Weber, 1964, p. 328, p. 341.). Like traditional authority it does not originate in obedience to a set of rules, but stems from loyalty to a person - however, the loyalty involved in this new, male form of authority is not based on sacred traditions, but instead on male hegemony.

13. For an elaboration, please see the writings of the Norwegian psychologist Hanne Haavind, who has written on negotiation and power in heterosexual relations. Haavind believes that dominance in relationships is an outcome of processes of negotiation, where dominance is of a less visible form and redefined by the participants as love or expediency (Haavind, 1985).
14. Walby and Jónasdóttir live in different countries and forms of welfare state, which I think influence their writings. Whereas Sweden has been described as an idealtype of a welfare state model with comprehensive, universal social policies and as 'potentially women-friendly', Great Britain has been characterised as a more marginal form of welfare state, where the state intervenes less in the market (Esping-Andersen & Korpi, 1987) (Hernes, 1987, p. 15).
15. Isaac is inspired by the English philosopher of science Roy Bhaskar and Giddens. From Bhaskar he takes over an argument about the structuration of the social world and of the ontology of structures. He elaborates and specifies upon the 'dialectics of control', which is a concept borrowed from Giddens. For an elaboration, please see pp. 115-118 in my thesis (Dahl, 1993).
16. An example of a marginal form of power, which is not included in Isaac's definition, is the self-surveillance we as modern, Western women exercise over our bodies. It is a form of power, which is not necessarily constituted in an enduring social relation (Bartky, 1988, pp. 61-86).
17. In my presentation of Arendt's and Ferguson's views upon power-to, I have been selective and emphasized their commonalities. Certain aspects of Arendt's view such as the unity between speech and action as well as the interconnection between politics and ethics are not dealt with. For an elaboration, please consult my thesis pp. 127-128 (Dahl, 1993). Furthermore, there are problematic aspects of Ferguson's conceptualisation, such as the deduction of 'empowerment' from women's experiences. This introduces the question of 'empowerment' as a specifically female form for power, or alternatively as a more general aspect of power. Additionally, there exist elements of another concept of power in Ferguson's conceptualisation. Ferguson also perceives power as a broad kind of interactive competence: a way of living together and of exercising power (Ferguson, 1987, p. 222).

## **Bibliography:**

Arendt, Hannah (1958), **The Human Condition**, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Arendt, Hannah (1986): 'Communicative Power', in **Power**, Steven Lukes (ed.), Blackwell, Oxford.

Bartky, Sandra Lee (1988): 'Foucault, Femininity, and the Modernization of Patriarchal Power', in **Feminism & Foucault - Reflections on Resistance**, I. Diamond & L. Quinby (eds.), Northeastern University Press, Boston. pp. 61-86.

Cohen, G.A. (1979): 'The Labor Theory of Value and the Concept of Exploitation', **Philosophy and Public Affairs**, vol 8, no 4, pp. 338-360.

Connell, R.W. (1987), **Gender & Power**, Polity, Cambridge.

Connolly, William C. (1974), **The Terms of Political Discourse**, M. Robertson, Oxford.

Dahl, Hanne Marlene (1989), **Work out with Walby - Patriarchy at Work and why it doesn't Work**, MA- dissertation, Dept. of Government, University of Essex, unpublished.

Dahl, Hanne Marlene (1993), **Two Faces of Patriarchy: Love and Work - and their Inadequacies**, Institute of Political Science, University of Aarhus, thesis, unpublished.

Dahl, Robert (1957): 'The Concept of Power', **Behavioral Science**, no 2, pp. 201-205.

Esping-Andersen, Gösta & Walter Korpi (1987): 'From Poor Relief to Institutional Welfare States: The Development of Scandinavian Social Policy', in **The Scandinavian Model**, Robert Erikson et.al. (eds.), M. E. Sharpe, New York.

- Ferguson, Kathy (1987): 'Male-Ordered Politics: Feminism and Political Science', in **Idioms of Political Inquiry - Critique and Renewal in Political Science**, Terence Ball (ed.), State University of New York Press, Albany, pp. 209-229.
- Flax, Jane (1990), **Thinking Fragments - Psychoanalysis, Feminism and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West**, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Foucault, Michel (1978), **The History of Sexuality**, Random House, Suffolk.
- Foucault, Michel (1980), **Power/Knowledge**, Colin Gordon (ed.), Random House, New York.
- Foucault, Michel (1982): 'The Subject and Power', in **Michel Foucault - Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics**, H.L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (eds.) Harvester Press, Brighton.
- Giddens, Anthony (1979), **Central Problems in Social Theory**, Macmillan, London.
- Giddens, Anthony (1984), **The Constitution of Society**, Polity, Cambridge.
- Haavind, Hanne (1985): 'Förändringar i förhållandet mellan kvinnor och män', **Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidsskrift**, no 3, pp. 17-27.
- Hernes Helga (1987), **Welfare State and Woman Power**, Norwegian University Press, Oslo.
- Hollway, Wendy: 'Gender Differences and the Production of Subjectivity', in **Changing the Subject**, J. Henriques et.al. (eds.), London, Methuen, pp. 227-263.
- Hollway, Wendy (1989), **Subjectivity and Method in Psychology**, Sage, London.
- Isaac, Jeffrey C. (1987), **Power and Marxist Theory - A Realist View**, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1984), **Kvinnoteori. Några perspektiv och problem inom kvinnoforskningens teoribildning**, Högskolan i Örebro, skriftserie 32.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1986): 'Køn, Maktens Kriterier och Mansvældets Legitimitet' **Makt och Kön**, JÄMFO-rapport nr. 2, Stockholm, pp. 139-156.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1991), **Love Power and Political Interests**, Örebro Studies, Kumla.
- Kruckow, Marianne (1992): 'Kvindelighed og magt i et generationsperspektiv', **Kvinder og magt**, Samkvinds skriftserie, København, pp. 61-75.
- Kvinnor och män i Norden** (1988), Nord, Stockholm.
- Siim, Birte (1992): 'Feministiske perspektiver på køn og magt', **Kvinder og magt**, Samkvinds skriftserie, København, pp. 5-16.
- Walby, Sylvia (1986), **Patriarchy at Work**, Polity, Cambridge.
- Walby, Sylvia (1989): 'Theorizing Patriarchy', **Sociology**, vol 23, no 2, pp. 213-234.
- Walby, Sylvia (1990), **Theorizing Patriarchy**, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Weber, Max (1964), **The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation**, transl. A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons, The Free Press, Macmillan, London.
- Weber, Max (1984), **Sociologische Grundbegriffe**, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen.
- Weedon, Chris (1987), **Feminist Practice & Poststructuralist Theory**, Blackwell, Oxford.

# **Programme**

## **Gender Relations - State, Market, and Civil Society The Nordic Experiences in a European Perspective**

**Aalborg University, Fibigerstræde 2  
August 14 - 18, 1993**

**Programme Committee:  
Ruth Emerek, Ulla Koch, Anna-Birte Ravn, and Birte Siim**

## Sunday, August 15

- 9.00 - 10.00 a.m. **Registration and coffee**
- 10.00 - 10.30 a.m. **Introduction and presentation**
- 10.30 - 12.30 a.m. **Sylvia Walby:** *Different Forms of Patriarchy: European Comparisons*
- 12.30 - 2.00 p.m. **Lunch and coffee**
- 2.00 - 3.00 p.m. **Section I: Gender and the Labour Market**  
Introduction by Ruth Emerek & Bodil Bjerring: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender and the Labour Market: Status and Visions*
- 3.00 - 6.00 p.m. **Short presentation of participants' papers in section I**  
Discussion of main problems and key concepts  
Chair: Drude Dahlerup  
Marianne Rostgård: *The Creation of a Gendered Division of Labour in the Danish Textile Industry*  
Iris Rittenhofer: *Leadership in a Genderhistorical Perspective*  
Yvonne Due Billing: *Gender and Organization: Towards a Differentiated Understanding*  
Eileen Drew: *The Part-Time Option? Women and Part-Time Work in the European Community*  
Bodil Bjerring: *Women's Industrial Work in North Jutland*  
Ruth Emerek: *On the Subject of Measuring Women's (and Men's) Participation in the Labour Market - An Attempt to categorize and examine Wage Earners Participation in the Labour Market*
- 6.00 - 8.00 p.m. **Dinner**
- 8.00 - 9.30 p.m. **Ph.D. programmes in England, Ireland and Sweden**  
Introduction by Sylvia Walby, Eileen Drew & Yvonne Hirdman

## Monday, August 16

- 9.00 - 10.45 a.m. **Jane Lewis:** *Gender and Social Policy in Europe: Work, the Family, and the State*
- 10.45 - 11.00 a.m. **Coffee break**
- 11.00 - 12.00 a.m. **Section II: Gender, Welfare, and the Family**  
Introduction by Maren Bak: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender, Welfare and the Family: Status and Visions*
- 12.00 - 1.00 p.m. **Section III: Gender, Power, and Democratic Citizenship**  
Introduction by Birte Siim: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender, Power, and Democratic Citizenship: Status and Visions*
- 1.00 - 3.00 p.m. **Lunch and coffee**

- 3.00 - 6.00 p.m. **Short presentation of participants' papers in section II & III**  
 Discussion of main problems and key concepts  
 Chair: Karen Sjørup  
 Ulla Koch: *Studying Care in Modern Economies - Considerations on Methods and Theory Building*  
 Drude Dahlerup: *Learning to Live with the State. State, Market and Civic Society: Women's Need for State Intervention in East and West*  
 Anette Aunbirk: *Negotiating Parental Leave*  
 Maren Bak: *Family Research and Theory in Denmark: A Literature Review*  
 Birte Siim: *Gender, Power and, Democratic Citizenship*  
 Ann-Dorte Christensen: *Gender, Mobilization, and Empowerment*
- 7.30 - **Dinner**

## Tuesday, August 17

- 9.00 - 10.45 a.m. **Yvonne Hirdman: Gender Systems and the Nordic Welfare States**  
 10.45 - 11.00 a.m. **Coffee break**  
 11.00 - 12.00 a.m. **Section IV: Gender Theory and Feminist Research**  
 Introduction by Anna-Birte Ravn & Susanne Thorbek: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender Theory: Status and Visions*
- 12.00 - 2.00 p.m. **Lunch and coffee**
- 2.00 - 4.00 p.m. **Short presentation of participants' papers in section IV**  
 Discussion of main problems and key concepts  
 Chair: Birte Siim  
 Karen Sjørup: *Patriarchy and the Female Subject*  
 Hanne Marlene Dahl: *Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird Without Wings? Power, Signification and Gender in the Reproduction of Patriarchy*  
 Lene Gregersen: *Moving far beyond the Separated Fields of Patriarchal Scholarship; the Qualitative Leap of Philosophical Daring*  
 Susanne Thorbek: *Gender in two Slum Cultures*  
 Anna-Birte Ravn: *Equality versus Difference and Gender versus Class in Danish Women's History*
- 4.00 - 5.00 p.m. **General conclusions on the contents of Ph.D. programmes in social science gender studies**  
 Chair: Ruth Emerek, Ulla Koch, Anna-Birte Ravn and Birte Siim

## Wednesday, August 18

- 9.00 - 12.00 a.m. Meeting on future national and international cooperation on Ph.D. programmes in social science gender studies



## Conference papers published elsewhere:

Sylvia Walby: 'Gender, Work and Fordism: The EC Context'. **International Journal of Sociology**, Winter 1994-95. To be reprinted in Thomas Boje (ed.): **Welfare State and the Labour Market in a Changing Europe: Consequences for Citizenship, Work and Gender**. M.E. Sharpe.

Yvonne Hirdmann: **Women - from Possibility to Problem? Gender Conflict in the Welfare State - the Swedish Model**. Research Report No. 3, 1994, Stockholm: Arbetslivscentrum.

Marianne Rostgård: 'The Creation of a Gendered Division of Labour in the Danish Textile Industry'. In Gertjan de Groot & Marlou Schrover (eds.): **Women Workers and Technological Change in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Europe**. The Falmer Press (UK), 1994.

Yvonne Due Billing & Mats Alvesson: 'Gender and Organization: Towards a Differentiated Understanding'. **Organization Studies** 13/12 1992, 73-102.

Eileen Drew: 'The Part-Time Option? Women and Part-Time Work in the European Community'. **Women's Studies International Forum**, Vol. 15, Nos. 5/6, 1992, 607-614.

Bodil Bjerring: 'Kvinder på fabriksarbejde i Nordjylland'. In Esther Fihl & Jens Pinholt: **Livsformer og kultur**. Århus: Akademisk Forlag 1992.

Drude Dahlerup: 'Learning to Live with the State - State, Market, and Civil Society: Women's Need for State Intervention in East and West'. **Women's Studies International Forum**, Vol. 17, Nos. 2/3, 1994, 117-127.

Anette Aunbirk: 'Forhandling om forældreorlov'. **Dansk Sociologi** nr. 3. 1993, 56-72.

Susanne Thorbek: 'Gender in Two Slum Cultures'. In Signe Arnfred et al. (eds.): **The Language of Development Studies**. Copenhagen 1990. And in **Environment and Urbanization**, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1991.

Anna-Birte Ravn: 'Equality versus Difference and Gender versus Class in Danish Women's History'. To appear in **NORA - Nordic Journal of Women's Studies**, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1995.

## **Publications in FREIA's paper series:**

1. Karin Widerberg: Udfordringer til kvinneforskningen i 1990'erne - foredrag på Center for Kvinneforskning i Aalborg 10.5.90, 1992
2. Feminist Research. Aalborg University. Report 1976-1991, 1992
3. Ann-Dorte Christensen: Kvinder i den nye fredsbevægelse i Danmark - mellem køkkenruller, resolutioner og teltpæle, 1992
4. Ulla Koch: Uformel økonomi og social arbejdsdeling - en fortælling om tværfaglighed og det umuliges kunst, 1992
5. Marianne Rostgaard: Kvindearbejde og kønsarbejdsdeling i tekstilindustrien i Danmark ca. 1830 - 1915, 1992
6. Inger Agger: Køn og krænkelse - om politisk vold mod kvinder, 1992
7. Margrethe Holm Andersen: Heks, hore eller heltinde? - et case-studie om tanzanianske kvinders politiske deltagelse og kønsideologier i forandring, 1993
8. Ulla Koch: A Feminist Political Economics of Integration in the European Community - an outline, 1993
9. Susanne Thorbek: Urbanization, Slum Culture, Gender Struggle and Women's Identity, 1993
10. Susanne Thorbek: Køn og Urbanisering, 1994
11. Poul Knopp Damkjær: Kvinder & rektorstillinger - et indlæg i ligestillingsdebatten, 1994
12. Birte Siim: Det kønnede demokrati - kvinders medborgerskab i de skandinaviske velfærdsstater, 1994
13. Anna-Birte Ravn: Kønsarbejdsdeling - diskurs og magt, 1994.
14. Bente Rosenbeck: Med kønnet tilbage til den politiske historie, 1994
15. Jytte Bang og Susanne Stubgaard: Piger og fysik i gymnasiet, 1994
16. Harriet Bjerrum Nielsen og Monica Rudberg: Jenter og gutter i forandring, 1994
17. Jane Lewis: Gender, Family and the Study of Welfare 'Regimes', 1995
18. Iris Rittenhofer: A Roll in the Hay with the Director: The Manager in a Genderhistorical Perspective, 1995

19. Ruth Emerek: On the Subject of Measuring Women's (and Men's) Participation in the Labour Market, 1995
20. Maren Bak: Family Research and Theory in Denmark: A Literature Review, 1995
21. Ann-Dorte Christensen & Birte Siim: Gender, Citizenship and Political Mobilization, 1995
22. Hanne Marlene Dahl: Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird without Wings? Power, Signification and Gender in the Reproduction of Patriarchy, 1995

FREIA - the Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg is an interdisciplinary organization of feminist researchers at Aalborg University. Focus of the centre lies within the social sciences, especially the fields of anthropology, history, sociology/social science, political science, economics and development studies. The present research programme "Gender relations - power, identity and social change" forms the framework of a number of individual and collective projects. FREIA is part of the Department of Development and Planning at Aalborg University.